



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and Lope Felix. Barrera's surmise was entirely correct, only he was unable to prove it, though he really had the proof at hand and gives it in his *Life of Lope*, only in some unaccountable way he overlooked it.

In the first place it never was certain that the lady's name was *Maria* de Lujan. That name, as it turns out, was first given by Álvarez y Baena, in his *Hijos de Madrid*, but Barrera shows that he is not an entirely trustworthy authority. Now, however, since Pérez Pastor published his *Datos acerca de Lope de Vega*,⁵ all doubt has been removed. In *Documento num. 7*, we read:

"En la iglesia parrochial de San Sebastian de la villa de Madrid, en siete de Febrero de mil y seiscientos y siete años, yo, Alonso del Arco, baticé un niño (*nacido?*) en veinte y ocho de Enero del dicho año, hijo de Lope de Vega Carpio y de Micaela de Lujan, y le pusieron por nombre Lope, y fueron sus padrinos D. Hurtado de Mendoza y Hieronima de Burgos."

The name is therefore not 'Maria de Lujan,' but 'Micaela de Lujan' or Luxan, and an almost perfect anagram is 'Camila Luzinda.'

One of the sponsors is Hierónima de Burgos, a famous actress of the time and also an intimate friend of Lope's. Micaela de Luxan was therefore, also, in all probability an actress, and this conjecture is made certain by a statement of Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa in his *Plaza Universal*, written in 1610-11, and first published in 1615. I quote from the edition of Perpignan, 1630 (p. 336). Here among the most famous actresses then living he mentions:

"Juana de Villalua, Mariflores, Michaela de Luzan, Ana Muños, Jusepa Vaca, Geronima de Burgos, Polonia Perez, Maria de los Angeles and Maria de Morales."

I have searched in vain, however, in such books as are at my command, for any further notice of Micaela de Luxan. She is not mentioned in Cassiano Pellicer, *Tratado Histórico sobre el Origen y Progresos de la Comedia y del Histrionismo en España*, Madrid, 1804; nor does Gallardo give the name in his list of *Comediantes*. From the fact that Suárez de Figueroa mentions Micaela de Luxan as living in 1610, it does not follow, of course, that she was also still acting. I am rather of the opinion that her stage career was confined to

the last decade of the sixteenth, and the first years of the seventeenth century. Unfortunately such lists of players as are found in books accessible to me are generally of a later date—after 1615, and mostly after 1625.

Of the lists given in MSS. of Lope's plays, the earliest that I have been able to consult are of the year 1610; they are *La hermosa Ester* and *La Encomienda bien guardada*, in neither of which do we find the name Micaela de Luxan. An examination, however, of some of the earlier MSS. of Lope, of which at least five are known prior to 1598, would probably reveal the name.

How long this love affair with Micaela de Luxan lasted we do not know. After the death of Lope's second wife, Doña Juana, in 1613, he took his two children, Marcela and Lope Felix, into his own care. Where they had been prior to this time is a matter of conjecture. Did they continue to be in the care of their mother, Lucinda? It would be interesting to know. Certain it is, however, that by the close of the year 1615 Lope is on with a new love—Doña María de Nevares Santoyo, the *Amarilis* of his later verses.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

An Old English Martyrology. Re-edited from manuscripts in the libraries of the British Museum, and of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, with introduction and notes by GEORGE HERZSFELD, Ph. D. London: Published for the E. E. T. S. by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1900. xlii+243 pp.

THIS is in some respects one of the most important of recent Old English reprints. In the first place, one of the manuscripts upon which the text is based, though only a fragment, belongs among the oldest manuscripts of English literature. Secondly, the *Martyrology* is one of the most extensive monuments of Old English prose that has appeared during the last few years, and the text is in itself doubly interesting because it appears to have been, in its earliest form, of Anglian or Mercian origin. Finally, Herzberg's book is important

⁵ *Homenaje á Menéndez y Pelayo*, Vol. i, p. 595.

because the text was previously inaccessible to most students of Old English literature, for Cockayne's edition¹ has long been out of print.

Herzberg has, generally speaking, done his work well, especially the Introduction, which embraces forty-three pages, and treats of the origin and growth of Martyrologies in the early Christian church, the genealogy of the several manuscripts, the date of the oldest text, the locality where it originated, and the sources of the Old English Martyrology. The text and a parallel modern English translation embrace two hundred and twenty-three of the two hundred and forty-three pages of the book, the remaining twenty pages being devoted to Notes and Corrigenda, and an alphabetical list of the saints whose names occur in the Martyrology.

From the Introduction we learn that Martyrologies are legal descendants of the early church calendars and Legendaria. Some of the less important ones date back to the third and fourth centuries, but the most important of the early martyrologies for the Western Church dates from the time of St. Jerome, to whom it was long incorrectly attributed. From this pseudo-Jerome, the lesser Roman Martyrology (*Martyrologium Romanum parvum*, discovered by Ado, Archbishop of Vienne, at Ravenna in 850), and the work of Bede and Florus, all later Books of Martyrs have been derived. Such collections, the editor thinks, were intended to refresh the memory of the monastic preacher, and to supply him with the ground-work of his sermons.

Four manuscripts of the Old English Martyrology have come down to us, all incomplete. Two of these, A and D, are mere fragments, while B and C are more extensive and complete. While A (Brit. Mus., Addit. 23211) is a bare fragment covering one small leaf, it is nevertheless very valuable because of its antiquity (it is attributed to the latter half of the ninth century), and its Mercian dialect. And D (Corp. Christ. Coll., Cambr., No. 41), though a late West Saxon manuscript, is almost equally valuable, since it is the only one which contains the entries from December 25 to 31 (pp. 1 to 10 of the text). This manu-

script is the well known Parker MS. of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. Miller, in the Introduction of his edition of the Old English version of Bede, places the date of D "at about the time of the Conquest," but Herzberg thinks "we may put it down as belonging to the end of the eleventh century as the earliest date." The text of this manuscript also shows undoubted Mercian influence.

Of the two longer manuscripts B (Brit. Mus., Cod. Cotton, Julius A x) and C (Corp. Christ. Coll. Cambr., No. 196) the editor considers the former the better and more reliable, and therefore makes it the basis of his text. B

"is a West Saxon transcript of a Mercian manuscript, as is shown by the numerous Mercian forms occurring in it; at the same time the prevailing influence of the West Saxon dialect is undeniable."

C, though "apparently somewhat earlier than B,"² contains more mistakes in the form of omissions and interpolations. It seems to have "been written about the beginning of the tenth century," and differs from B in showing a much smaller proportion of Mercian forms; but C contains "many traces of late West Saxon and even a few of the Kentish dialect." It is the only manuscript that contains the latter part of the text (p. 204, 4 to end).

Herzberg shows by careful investigation that B follows A very closely, and he is led to believe that both manuscripts go back to the same original:

"The scribe of A may have possibly had the archetype before him. As to B, which is a much later copy, it is reasonable to assume that there must have been a link between it and O, because it shows a number of mistakes of its own. Besides it is pretty sure that C must be derived from the same source as B, as they have certain mistakes in common."³

In regard to the date of the Martyrology Cockayne says in a note at the end of his text:⁴

"We must conclude that this Martyrology is of the age of Alfred; none of its materials are

² I am inclined to think Herzberg wrong in saying this manuscript was "apparently written in the second half of the tenth century." It is written in a distinct eleventh century hand, characteristic of the period just before the Conquest.

³ See pp. xi-xiii.

⁴ *The Shrine*, p. 157. Cf. pp. 45, 124, 148.

¹ In *The Shrine* (1864-73).

more recent; it is further directly indebted to that king himself, and doubtless composed under his direction; it draws from Benedictine, Roman, English and Syriac sources."

Herzberg shows that Cockayne's statements are for the most part unfounded. While the existence of a fragment (MS. A) from the latter part of the ninth century would seem to prove that the *Book of Martyrs* is as old as King Alfred, "there is not the vestige of a proof" that he had anything to do with its composition. The text, in its original form, seems upon quite trustworthy evidence to have been composed in a Mercian monastery, and the Mercian district "never formed a part of King Alfred's dominion." Moreover, the presumption is very strong

"that the book was composed merely for the use of the monks in their services, and the King cannot be expected to have meddled with a matter of monastic discipline."

The last point does not seem to be well taken, when we remember that King Alfred concerned himself zealously with the spiritual affairs of his kingdom; and we may be sure from what we know of his character that he would not have hesitated to meddle with monastic discipline, had he considered it necessary, or of great importance to his people.

To what extent certain legends recorded in the Martyrology are derived directly from oriental sources, it is difficult to say. Cockayne holds⁵ that the legends of St. Mylas and Senneus (Nov. 15), for example,

"must have reached our English bishop direct from Syria, probably from Helias, patriarch of Jerusalem, with whom a correspondence of King Alfred is expressly recorded in the nearly contemporary 'Leech book.'"

Herzberg has shown that the materials might easily have come into England through other channels. Before the time of Alfred the Great "Englishmen had plenty of opportunities for acquiring knowledge of Oriental legends. A perpetual intercourse between English and French monasteries had been going on from an early period. In France the appearance of Oriental monks was by no means infrequent."⁶

Still, if King Alfred was in correspondence with the patriarch of Jerusalem, as Cockayne states, at a time when there existed "a passion

for investigation into ritual and ecclesiastical antiquity generally," there is no reason why he should not have received the legends direct from Jerusalem.

Herzberg seems to be clearly in the right in claiming a Mercian origin for the text of the Martyrology, and there is no apparent objection to his suggestion of "Lincolnshire as the place where it was composed." It is interesting to learn in this connection "that very few South English martyrs have found their way into the list of saints," in fact only three; while "all the other English saints belong to the Mercian or Northumbrian provinces." A few noteworthy omissions from the list of Martyrs, like that of St. Boniface, would also seem to be against a West Saxon origin of the Martyrology.

Judging from grammatical peculiarities the editor thinks

"the Martyrology can not possibly be later than 900. We might even fix its date as early as 850, if we are allowed to draw any conclusions from the syntax."

In his investigations of the sources, Herzberg has succeeded in finding originals for almost all the legends and anecdotes recorded in the Martyrology. The researches of Cockayne in this direction rendered the task much less difficult, and the importance of his work receives just acknowledgment. Of about two hundred and thirty different legends, events, and anecdotes mentioned in the book, there are only twenty for which no originals have yet been discovered.

The attempt to show the indirect influence of the Talmudic writings upon the account of the creation (March 19-23) is interesting, but the evidence produced is not entirely convincing.⁷ The source of the 'Harrowing of Hell' incident (March 26)⁸ is certainly not biblical, unless we consider the bible in a very loose, indefinite sense as the source of such mediæval treatises as the *Gesta Pilati*, and especially of the second part of the "Pseudo-Gospel of Nicodemus." The contents of this interesting entry show that the source was most likely the second part of the *Evangelii Nicodemi*, otherwise entitled⁹ *Descensus Christi*

⁵ *The Shrine*, p. 148.

⁶ P. xxxix; Cf. pp. 178 and 200.

⁷ See pp. xxxv and 226-7. ⁸ Cf. pp. xxxviii and 30.

⁹ Cf. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 368 ff.

ad Inferos. The presence of this description in the Martyrology bears further testimony¹⁰ to the popularity of the "Harrowing" episode in Old English literature.

The compiler of the Old English text has on the whole followed the Latin original very closely:

"He does not give much more than a mere outline of the legends, and sometimes not even so much; in a few cases, however, he enlarges on a story which seems to have struck his fancy as being peculiar and out of the way."¹¹

Herzberg does not seem to me to have been so happy in building up his text from the somewhat confusing materials of the several manuscripts, as in the disposal of literary-historical questions of sources, date or origin, etc. He has, to be sure, given us a clear and generally reliable text, that is, from his point of view. Objection, however, might be raised to his method of procedure, and it may be that the editor was not altogether responsible for this. Where two manuscripts of a text present so many orthographical and syntactical differences as do B and C, it would certainly be more desirable to print the two parallel, as the marginal notes would otherwise assume undue proportions. Since this plan was not adopted, doubtless for valid reasons, we have a right to expect that the foot-notes shall be carefully and orderly arranged, and shall contain sufficient hints and materials to enable the student to restore the original reading of any one of the manuscripts. In this respect Herzberg's notes are frequently very deficient. It would be impossible for one to gain more than a faint conception of the orthography of C, for instance, from the help given in the marginal notes, beginning with page 40. And the additional materials and suggestions of the Introduction and Addenda do not improve the confusion which such an arrangement as Herzberg's is sure to produce. If a few hints had been given in the foot-notes, such as that the form *twentigoðan* always occurs in C, and that *ys*, *hig*, *ylcan*, *sylf(e)*, *worulde*, etc., are regular forms of C, the editor could have avoided repeating "twentigoðan, etc., C" for

dozens of times. Moreover, whenever a form is given in the notes as occurring in C, he should have been careful to give the exact reading of C, and not that of B, or his own normalized forms. For example, the reading of C 40, 11 (note) is *myd þe beon*, not *mid*, etc.; 42, 10 (note) *se hyt* (not *hit*); 42, 11 *ðe ðær æt hym* not *him*; 42, 23 *syðon* not *sīðon*, etc. Such slips are not sufficiently excused by the statement made in the Introduction¹² that *y* continually occurs for *i* in manuscript C. In fact, there are several instances in which C has *i*, and B, *y*, although the *y* forms in C are the rule.

Of course, every one who has had experience in editing texts from several different manuscripts will appreciate the difficulties which Herzberg met with in attempting to give only a partial list of the variants in a correct form. The strongest objections to the plan he pursued are that he seems to have had no method in noting different readings, and his text is not sufficient for purposes of careful scholarship. The following are the *errata* which I noticed in making a careful comparison of Herzberg's text (pp. 40-70)¹³ with my own collation of manuscript C. From the beginning to page 40 the editor had comparatively easy sailing, as he generally had only one manuscript to deal with. In these first forty pages (that is, twenty pages of text) there are several minor mistakes, such as failure to indicate the manuscript abbreviations for *m*, *n*, and *er*, but I have noticed no serious errors. It is with page 40 that manuscript C begins, and from this point on mistakes, misprints, and omissions, for the most part in the marginal notes, are very frequent.

41, 11, (note) *myd þe beon* C; *penden*] *pa hwile* C; 21, *fylledflod* C. 42, 3, *untrūmyssa* C; 5, *sumere* C; 6, *dæg, undernreste* C; 9, 7 *se hyra þegen wæs* C; 10, *pa sealde se hyt pam* C; 11, *ondranc* (?) B; 12, *hig, þ hyt* C; 14, *hig* C; 19, *gesingodon* C; 22, *mennisc* C; 23, *singiað syðon* C; 25, *wanað* C; 27, *symle* C; 28, *ponne he byð beforan hyre þonne wanað hys leoht* C (after *leoht* of text;—this sentence escaped Herzberg entirely). 44, 2, *symle* C; 4, *bene-*

¹² P. xiii.

¹³ I did not have time to complete the collation of the MS. when last in Cambridge.

¹⁰ Cf. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xiii, 462-3.

¹¹ See p. xxxvi.

dictus C; 5, *abbudes* C; 7, *syllan* C; 8, *forðam* C; 10, *swa* C; 24, *on þam . . . gesceop* C; 25, *woruldsnottere* C. 46, 5, *feldam* C; 8, *fenne* C; 10, *pā dage* C; 11, *seo was gesceapen* C; 12, *wylðdeor* C; 13, *myhton* C; 14, *gehcoldon* C; 15, *mennisce* C; 17, *feor* C; 22, *prowode* C. 50, 6, *eond* C; 8, B omits *ealle*; 14, *nu* om. C, *myd pynū* C; 23, *seofen* C; 26, *beobread* C] *bebread* (?) B. 52, 6, *hyt byð medemū men* C; 12, *dæg byð þ ylce* C; 13, *on pone* C. 54, 2, *sisininus*, *chionian* C; 5, *hrægel* C; 13, *wið strangre peode* (mid of text misprint!); 14, *pa ætywde* C; 18, *swylce hylle* C; 20, *7 pa sona* C; 27, *ðæssalonica* B; 27, *swuſtra* C] *sweoſtra* (?) B. 56, 2, *1 pæra nama* C; 3, *sorotina* C; 7, *hys nama wæs on leden*, *minus* C; 11, *pæs* om. C; 21, *fyðera* C. 58, 1, *byð pæs* C; 2, *sce* om. C, *anthie*, 7 C; 7, *on þ scryð* C; 13, *up* C; 14, *7 pa het* C. 60, 1, *7 pa, hyne, forhwan* C; *fregn* (?) B; 2, *hu myhte butu samod* C; 4, *georius* C; 5, *seofan* (?) B, *seofen* C; 10, *pe myd hym ær*, *tyntregodon* C; 16, *frecnesse* (?) B, *frecednyſſe* C; 17, *stefen* C; 21, *ongytan* C (not "B" as Herzberg notes); 26, *wylferðes* C, *gewytenmys* C] *geleornes* B (Herzberg repeats this note several times). 62, 5, *7 onsundru* C; 13, *milcelra* (?) B] *mycelra* C; 14, *heom forgife* C; 15, *smyllice* C. 64, 1, *æfestegodon* C; 6, *on æfenne* C; 10, *myd pig rape* C; 19, *cwæð he wá* om. C; 23, *hi preagean*] *preatian hig* C; 24, *myd þam hig ne myhte* C; 27, *up dryhten myn* C. 66, 1, *tyd 7 ðrowung* C; 2, *pynne* C; 11, *hym fylfan* C; 12, *siððan* om. C; 13, *wundru* C; 15, *in pa ceastre* C; 16, *ys gehaten* C; 19, *morgesteorra* C; 25, *myd* C. 68, 4, *myd . . . myhte* C; 6, *hyne* C; 7, *awyht* C; 8, *ofer hig ne come* C; 9, *oðra* C; 10, *seo* om. C; 17, *ceaster* C: 24, *brytene* C; 25, *on dæg* C; 26, *philippus* C. 70, 4, *ys þonne* C; 8, *dohtor* C; 15, *werod* C; 26, *1 pa het pæne pap-an* C. 72, 6, *pe hatte nu . . . ia* (*numentana*) C; 13, *byrgenne 7 hys lich* C; 21, *pæm* om. *crystene* C; 24, *þ ys* C, not omitted as Herzberg states.¹⁴

Herzberg's translation is not all that could be wished, but he generally succeeds in reproducing the meaning of the original in lan-

¹⁴ In the preceding list I have noted especially errors in Herzberg's marginal notes, and words or phrases omitted from or added in C which he has not given. Of course, no attempt has been made to enumerate the scores of variant readings in C, which he apparently omitted purposely.

guage which, though frequently crude and teeming with German idioms, is capable of being understood. Here as in the case of the text, one is at sea as to his method: one never knows whether he is trying to reproduce the original literally in modern English, or whether he is seeking a comparatively free translation. He has himself not told us any where what he is aiming at. His punctuation is about as bad as it could well be, and it is made the more so by the constant omission in the translation of the old English particles *ond*, *pa*, etc. There are accepted English forms of the names *Datianus*, *Diocletianus*, *Adrianus*, *Urbanus*, etc., but Herzberg does not use them.

In conclusion I cannot refrain from expressing the wish that the E.E.T.S. had embraced a good glossary in its plan of such publications, and left the translation to each individual student. Such publications as the present one, at least, appeal almost entirely to the limited world of English scholars and students to whom even a good translation is superfluous, but who would cherish a carefully made glossary. A glossary of such a little known text would also be a valuable contribution to English lexicography.

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

GOETHE.

Goethe über seine Dichtungen. Versuch einer Sammlung aller Aeusserungen des Dichters über seine poetischen Werke von HANS GERHARD GRAEF. Erster Theil: Die epischen Dichtungen: Erster Band. Frankfurt: Rütten und Loening, 1901. 8vo, xxiii+492 pp.

GRAEF aims to give all the utterances of Goethe concerning his poetic works with only the exception of his translations from foreign languages. He has divided his material into three parts, of which the first brings Goethe's utterances concerning his epic works in prose or verse, the second those about his dramatic works, and the third those regarding his lyric poems. Each of these three parts is to form a complete whole in itself, with separate pagination and separate full indexes; for convenience's sake, however, parts one and two are to be published in two volumes each.